



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/436,146	11/09/1999	JAN C. ZAWADZKI	247/235	6202

23419 7590 04/21/2003

COOLEY GODWARD, LLP
3000 EL CAMINO REAL
5 PALO ALTO SQUARE
PALO ALTO, CA 94306

EXAMINER

ALI, MOHAMMAD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/436,146

Applicant(s)

ZAWADZKI ET AL.

Examiner

Mohammad Ali

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawing objections

1. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Fig. 1 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label, "DBMS", "web interface" consecutively with elements 104, 108 etc. of Fig. 1, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A *descriptive* textual label for *each numbered element* in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83. 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:
"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office.

Response to Arguments

2. This office action is in response to the Amendments filed on February 25, 2003, Paper No. 11.

Claims 1-30 are pending in this Office Action. Claims 1 and 27 have been amended.

After a further search and a through examination of the present application, claims 1-30 are remain rejected.

Applicant's arguments filed on February 25, 2003 with respect to claims 1-30 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

First, Applicant's argues that Deinhart and Numerlin does not teach the contention of, "logging on to a project manager server from a computer network, said project manager server executing a project manager for creating a projects based upon

Art Unit: 2177

project management trees containing one or more data objects disposed to cooperatively effect project management".

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Deinhart teaches this limitation as a centralized distributed computer system (connected with server and client computer) for registering to the system, authorizing and control of access rights of subjects on objects in a computer system, wherein the system comprises users, groups, and access control lists (tree) at each object providing the access rights on the respective object (col. 1, lines 8-19 et seq). Although, Deinhart discloses logging to the project manager, which appear to be analogous to logging to the project manager connected with network as depicted in figure 1 of the present application. However, Nummelin discloses an analogous system wherein an enterprise project management system a project resource could log into a workstation and that workstation would function as both a project manager work station and resource workstation (col. 6, lines 8-11, Fig. 1 et seq). It would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the logging on to a project manager for creation, tracking and reporting of data objects based upon predetermined and validated categories of Nummelin to role-based access control in a distributed and centralized computer systems of Deinhart in order to have logging on to a project manager in centralized and distributed computer system for user role at col. 6 lines 8-11, Nummelin. Hence, claimed logging to a project manger from a computer network is same as Dienhart in view of Nummelin teaching of logging to a project manger from a computer network.

Second, Applicant's argues that Deinhart and Numerlin does not teach the contention of, "one or more organizational entities and one or more user groups associated with each organizational entities".

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Deinhart teaches this limitation as stated above. Although Deinhart discloses the one or more organizational entities for defining users group, which appear to be analogous as depicted in figure 3 of the present application. However, Nummelin discloses an analogous system wherein an enterprise project management system a project resource for organizing information (entity) stored in database that are accessed through the enterprise (col. 3, lines 3-5 et seq). It would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of managing enterprise of the present invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because the organizational entities of Nummelin system would have provided Deinhart's with necessary infrastructure, which would allow the organization entities in the network system to managing the project, as explained in Nummelin (col. 3, lines 3-5 et seq). Hence, claimed organizational entities associated with users group is same as Dienhart in view of Nummelin teachings organizational entities associated with users group.

Third, Applicant's argues that Deinhart does not teach the "user roles associated with at least one users".

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Deinhart teaches this limitation as access rights of subjects on objects for users in a computer system are controlled using parameterized role types instantiate

into role instance to role or groups to user (Abstract, lines 2-5 et seq). Hence claimed user roles are same as Deinhart user roles in the network system.

Fourth, Applicant's argues that Deinhart does not teach the "data structure containing hierarchical objects".

In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner respectfully submits that in particular, Deinhart teaches this limitation as the role type hierarchy are associated with data structure (col. 9, lines 13-14, Fig. 3A et seq). Hence claimed data structure hierarchy objects is similar to Deinhart data structure hierarchy.

In light of foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections have been sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

If this application currently names joint inventors, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary in considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

4. Claims 1-12, 18-22, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,911,143 issued to Deinhart et al. ("Deinhart") in view of US Patent 6,308,164 B1 issued to Nummelin et al ("Nummelin").

Deinhart renders obvious independent claim 1 by the following:

“...,a project manager server from a computer network” taught by Deinhart as a centralized distributed computer system (connected with server and client computer) for registering to the system, authorizing and control of access rights of subjects on objects in a computer system, wherein the system comprises users, groups, and access control lists (tree) at each object providing the access rights on the respective object (col. 1, lines 8-19 et seq) “..., one or more organizational,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30. “..., one or more user groups,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30. “defining one or more users associated,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 13-18. Finally, “defining user roles associated with at least one of the users” at col. 1 lines 7-18. Deinhart does not explicitly teach the logging on to a project manager, but Nummelin does teach at col. 6 lines 8-11. Thus, it would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the logging on to a project manager for creation, tracking and reporting of data objects based upon predetermined and validated categories of Nummelin to role-based access control in a distributed and centralized computer systems of Deinhart in order to have logging on to a project manager in centralized and distributed computer system for user role at col. 6 lines 8-11, Nummelin.

Claim 27 has same subject matter as of claim 1, except “centralized computer server” and Deinhart teaches at col. 1, lines 7-18 and essentially rejected as discussed in rejection of claim 1.

Deinhart renders obvious independent claim 19 by the following:

“a project manager for creating a project,...” taught by Deinhart a centralized distributed computer system (connected with server and client computer) for registering to the system, authorizing and control of access rights of subjects on objects in a computer system, wherein the system comprises users, groups, and access control lists (tree) at each object providing the access rights on the respective object (col. 1, lines 8-19 et seq). Further, “one or more internal,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30. Finally, “..., said project manager” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-18. Deihart does not explicitly teach the creating project for the enterprise, but Nummelin does teach such limitation at Abstract, lines 1-15. Thus, it would have obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the creating project for the enterprise for creation, tracking and reporting of data objects based upon predetermined and validated categories of Nummelin to role-based access control in a distributed and centralized computer systems of Deinhart in order to have creating project for the enterprise on to a project manager in centralized and distributed computer system for user role at Abstract, lines 1-15, Nummelin.

As per claims 2, 3 and 20, “...., interfacing with project management server” taught by Deinhart at col. 2 lines 27-41.

As per claim 4, “user roles include permission and security access rights,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 2 lines 27-41.

As per claim 5, “..., project manger server from a terminal,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30;

“creating a project associated one or more objects,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 2 lines 27-41.

As per claim 6, “project is created using a project tree data,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30.

As per claims 7 and 22, “...., tasks, costs, timesheets,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 3 lines 5-54.

As per claim 8, “providing a user identifier to the project management,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 16-30;

“..., one or more projects associated with the user,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-18;

“interfacing with the project by viewing objects,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 7 lines 19-21.

As per claims 9, 10, 11, and 18, “interfacing with project,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-18.

As per claim 21, “...., project manager for generating user,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 3 lines 19-34.

As per claim 12, “completing the user define,...” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-18.

As per claim 28, “...coupled to said centralized server computer” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-18.

As per claim 29, “...associated with at least one of the users” taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 21-55.

As per claim 30, "at least one user computer as said centralized server computer are operatively connected via a distributed communications network,..." taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 1-55.

5. Claims 13-17 and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 5,911,143 issued to Deinhart et al. ("Deinhart") in view of US Patent 6,308,164 B1 issued to Nummelin et al ("Nummelin") as applied to the rejection of claims 1-12, 18-22, and 27-30 above and further in view of US Patent 5,694,551 issued to Doyle et al. ("Doyle").

As per claims 13-17 and 23-26, "one or more response and matching" taught by Deinhart at col. 1 lines 7-55 and "completed user-defined spec" taught by Nummelin at col. 6 lines 8-11. Deinhart and Nummelin does not teaches the suppliers and price. However, Doyle does teaches the suppliers and price of data processing for handling the ordering, order tracking and accounting suppliers at col. 3 lines 8-40. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the suppliers and price of data processing of Doyle to role-based access control in a distributed and centralized computer systems of Deinhart and project creation, tracking and reporting of data objects based upon predetermined and validated categories of Nummelin in order to have means order processing in the in the centralized computer systems at col. 3 lines 8-40, Doyle.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad Ali whose telephone number is (703) 605-4356. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790 or TC 2100 customer service (703) 306-5631. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Application/Control Number: 09/436,146
Art Unit: 2177

Page 11

Mohammad Ali

Patent Examiner

April 14, 2003


SRIRAMA CHANNAVALJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER